

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * *

4 SILVER STATE BROADCASTING, LLC; a
5 Nevada LLC; ROYCE INTERNATIONAL
6 BROADCASTING CORPORATION; a
7 Nevada corporation; GOLDEN STATE
8 BROADCASTING LLC, a Nevada
9 corporation.
10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 BEASLEY FM ACQUISITION
13 CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation;
14 BEASLEY BROADCASTING OF
15 NEVADA, LLC, a North Carolina limited
16 liability company; WAEC LICENSE
17 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; a Delaware
18 limited partnership; KJUL LICENSE LLC, a
19 North Carolina limited liability company;
20 MICHAEL JAY BERGNER dba BERGNER
21 & CO., an individual; DOES 1 through 50;
22 and ROE ENTITIES 51 through 100,
23 inclusive.

24 Defendant.

Case No. 2:11-cv-01789-APG-CWH

Order Rejecting Joint Pretrial Order

(Dkt. #259)

25 The parties' proposed Joint Pretrial Order (Dkt. #259) does not comply with Local Rule
26 16-4. For example, in section VII(c), the "parties reserve all objections to exhibits at this time."
27 (Dkt. #259 at 11.) The Local Rule requires the parties to specify their objections, not reserve
28 them for later. Similarly, in their list of exhibits, "Counter-Claimants reserve the right to
supplement their list of exhibits with any of the documents identified in the list attached as
Exhibit 'A.'" Counter-defendant attempts to do the same thing, identifying "Any exhibits
identified in Plaintiff/Counterdefendants (sic) initial disclosures or supplements thereto." Parties
are required to disclose their trial exhibits and cannot "reserve their rights" or refer vaguely to
"any exhibits." Further, Counter-defendant designates entire deposition transcripts, rather than
specific page and line designations. Such vague, broad designations of exhibits and deposition

1 transcripts make it impossible for the other party to object. The proposed Order is replete with
2 additional inadequacies; I do not care to waste my time cataloguing those for the parties.

3 Local Rule 16-3 requires the parties to personally discuss these and other issues. The
4 requirements in Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 are designed to make the parties meaningfully discuss
5 the upcoming trial, so that the trial preparation and presentation can be streamlined and to foster
6 settlement. It is apparent from the proposed Joint Pretrial Order that the parties either ignored
7 Local Rule 16-3, or did not properly conduct the required conference in the spirit of the rule.
8 Accordingly,

9 IT IS ORDERED that the parties' Joint Pretrial Order (**Dkt. #259**) is **REJECTED**. The
10 parties shall personally confer as required in Local Rule 16-3, and submit a Joint Pretrial Order
11 that complies with Local Rule 16-4 within 21 days of entry of this Order.

12 Dated: this 4th day of April, 2016.

13 
14 _____
15 ANDREW P. GORDON
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28